

REMARKS

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3, 4, 20, 22, 37 and 41 have been amended to further define the invention. Claims 6 and 25 have been amended to correspond to the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 2, 21, 38 and 39 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 44 and 45 have been added. Claims 1, 3-20, 22-37 and 40-45 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

1. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith Jr. et al. (“Smith,” U.S. Patent No. 6,490,343) in view of Zou et al. (“Zou,” U.S. Patent No. 6,246,983). Applicant’s respectfully traverse the rejection. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 20, 22, 25, 37 and 41 have been amended. Claims 2, 21, 38 and 39 have been canceled.

a) Claims 1, 3-19 and 37

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method of producing custom output in response to user input received using a wireless Internet-enabled device and includes, among other limitations:

- a) receiving an input code from the wireless Internet-enabled device via a web interface of a server computer, the input code representing user input provided at the wireless Internet-enabled device;

- b) locating in a programmable device at least one user-specified output character associated with the user input, . . . ; and
- c) providing said at least one user-specified output character for use by an application program.

Amended independent claim 37 is directed to an apparatus for producing custom output in response to user input received using a wireless Internet-enabled device and includes, among other limitations:

- a) means for receiving an input code from the wireless Internet enabled device via a web interface of a server computer, the input code representing user input provided at the wireless Internet-enabled device; . . .
- c) means for locating in said means for storing at least one user-specified output character associated with the user input, . . . ; and
- d) means for providing said at least one user-specified output character for use by an application program.

As discussed in the specification, a wireless device 50 accesses a server 18 via a communication network 30, such as the Internet. See, Figure 1, Specification, page 6, lines 4-14. The server 18 includes a web interface to permit input codes to be received from the wireless device 50 via the Internet 30. See, Figures 1 and 2, Specification, page 7, line 25 to page 8, line 4. The input codes produced by the wireless device 50 are associated with user-specified output characters stored in a programmable device 12 of server 18. See, Specification, page 6,. Lines 22-27. Accordingly, the system allows a users to specify their own unique menu choices for user entry buttons on the wireless device and provide a degree of customization to the use of the Internet-enabled wireless device, for example, a wireless device having a microbrowser. See, Specification, page 2, lines 6-9 and page 6, lines 18-29.

In contrast, the combination of Smith and Zou does not teach, disclose or suggest receiving an input code from a wireless Internet-enabled device via a web interface of a server computer where the input code represents user input provided at the wireless Internet-enabled

device. Rather, Smith teaches telephone to telephone communication where at least one of the telephones is a code-compatible telephone configured to detect an incoming code and forward the corresponding message unit to an output device associated with the code-compatible telephone. See, Smith, Abstract, Figures 1a and 1C, col. 5, lines 10-17 and col. 6, lines 55-63. Smith teaches that a code-compatible telephone includes an I/O interface to receive signals such as DTMF tones or digitally encoded signals from a first telephone. See, Smith, Figure 2, col. 10, lines 3-8. There is, however, no teaching or suggestion in Smith of receiving an input code from an Internet-enabled device via a web interface of a server computer.

Zou teaches an e-mail reader program, resident on a computer, that may be accessed by a telephone over a telephone network and controlled over a voice connection using touch-tone keypad commands or voice commands. See, Zou, Abstract, Figures 1 and 2, col. 1, lines 50-57, col. 2, lines 49-55 and 59-64 and col. 3, lines 60-65. Administration of the e-mail reader program may be accomplished from a workstation connected to the e-mail reader computer via the Internet and the e-mail reader computer may access an Internet e-mail system to retrieve e-mail messages. See, Zou, Figures 1 and 2, col. 3, lines 15-40. However, input commands from the telephone for the e-mail reader are received from the telephone over the telephone network. See, Zou, Figures 1 and 2, col. 2, lines 49-55 and col. 3, lines 15-21, 22-40 and lines 51-65. There is no teaching or suggestion in Zou of receiving an input code from an Internet-enabled device via a web interface of a server computer. Zou states “[u]sing canned text messages, . . . the user is able to maintain a rich e-mail dialog without ever logging onto the Internet using a computer in the conventional sense.” See, Zou, col. 8, lines 42-46. Accordingly, the combination of Smith and Zou does not teach, disclose or suggest receiving an input code from a wireless Internet-enabled device via a web interface of a server computer where the input code represents user input provided at the wireless Internet-enabled device. Amended independent claims 1 and 37 are believed to be allowable over Smith in view of Zou.

Claims 3-19 depend from amended claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Smith in view of Zou for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claims 1, 3-19 and 37 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allowance of claims 1, 3-19 and 37 is respectfully requested.

b) Claims 20 and 22-36

Amended independent claim 20 is directed to an apparatus for producing custom output in response to user input received using a wireless Internet-enabled device and includes, among other limitations:

- a) a receiving interface operable to receive an input code from the wireless Internet-enabled device via a data communications network, the input code representing user input provided at the wireless Internet-enabled device; . . .
- c) a processor circuit . . . operable to locate in said programmable device at least one user-specified output character associated with the user input,

As discussed above with respect to amended claims 1 and 37, in the present application a wireless device 50 accesses a server 18 via a communication network 30, such as the Internet. See, Figure 1, Specification, page 6, lines 4-14. The server 18 includes a web interface to permit input codes to be received from the wireless device 50 via the Internet 30. See, Figures 1 and 2, Specification, page 7, line 25 to page 8, line 4. The input codes produced by the wireless device 50 are associated with user-specified output characters stored in a programmable device 12 of server 18. See, Specification, page 6,. Lines 22-27. Accordingly, the system allows a users to specify their own unique menu choices for user entry buttons on the wireless device and provide a degree of customization to the use of the Internet-enabled wireless device, for example, a

wireless device having a microbrowser. See, Specification, page 2, lines 6-9 and page 6, lines 18-29.

In contrast, the combination of Smith and Zou does not teach, disclose or suggest an apparatus having a receiving interface operable to receive an input code from the wireless Internet-enabled device via a data communications network where the input code representing user input provided at the wireless Internet-enabled device. As discussed above with respect to amended claim 1 and 37, Smith teaches telephone to telephone communication where at least one of the telephones is a code-compatible telephone configured to detect an incoming code and forward the corresponding message unit to an output device associated with the code-compatible telephone. See, Smith, Abstract, Figures 1a and 1C, col. 5, lines 10-17 and col. 6, lines 55-63. Zou teaches an e-mail reader program, resident on a computer, that may be accessed by a telephone over a telephone network and controlled over a voice connection using touch-tone keypad commands or voice commands. See, Zou, Abstract, Figures 1 and 2, col. 1, lines 50-57, col. 2, lines 49-55 and 59-64 and col. 3, lines 60-65. Zou states “[u]sing canned text messages, . . . the user is able to maintain a rich e-mail dialog without ever logging onto the Internet using a computer in the conventional sense.” See, Zou, col. 8, lines 42-46. There is, however, no teaching or suggestion in the combination of Smith and Zou of a receiving interface operable to receive an input code from the wireless Internet-enabled device via a data communications network where the input code representing user input provided at the wireless Internet-enabled device. Accordingly, amended independent claim 20 is believed to be allowable over Smith in view of Zou.

Claims 22-36 depend from amended claim 20 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 20 and are therefore allowable over Smith in view of Zou for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 20.

Accordingly, claims 20 and 22-36 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allowance of claims 20 and 22-36 is respectfully requested.

c) Claims 40-43

Independent claim 40 is directed to an apparatus for producing user-defined output-characters in response to input codes produced by a web-communicating input device and includes, among other limitations:

... a web server operable to establish communications with said web-communicating input device using the World Wide Web and programmed to produce at least one user-specified output character ... in response to receipt by said web server of an input code, from said web-communicating input device.

Amended independent claim 41 is directed to an e-mail system and includes, among other limitations:

- a) a web server operable to establish communications with web-communicating input devices using the World Wide Web; ...
- c) at least one of said web server and said e-mail server being programmed to produce at least one user-specified output character for use in a field of an e-mail response to receipt of an input code from one of said web-communicating input devices.

As discussed in the specification, a wireless device 50 accesses a server 18 via a communication network 30, such as the Internet. See, Figure 1, Specification, page 6, lines 4-14. The server 18 acts as an apparatus for producing user-defined output characters in response to input codes produced by a web-communicating input device and received via communications using the World Wide Web. See, Figure 1, Specification, page 12, lines 6-13. The server 18 and an e-mail server 20 act as an e-mail system. See, Figure 1, Specification, page 12, lines 14-20.

In contrast, the combination of Smith and Zou does not teach, disclose or suggest a web server operable to establish communications with a web-communicating input device using the World Wide Web and producing at least one user-specified output character for use in a field of an e-mail in response to receipt of an input code from the web-communicating input device. Rather, as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 37 and 20, Smith teaches telephone to

telephone communication where at least one of the telephones is a code-compatible telephone configured to detect an incoming code and forward the corresponding message unit to an output device associated with the code-compatible telephone. See, Smith, Abstract, Figures 1a and 1C, col. 5, lines 10-17 and col. 6, lines 55-63. Zou teaches an e-mail reader program, resident on a computer, that may be accessed by a telephone over a telephone network and controlled over a voice connection using touch-tone keypad commands or voice commands. See, Zou, Abstract, Figures 1 and 2, col. 1, lines 50-57, col. 2, lines 49-55 and 59-64 and col. 3, lines 60-65. Zou states “[u]sing canned text messages, . . . the user is able to maintain a rich e-mail dialog without ever logging onto the Internet using a computer in the conventional sense.” See, Zou, col. 8, lines 42-46. There is, however, no teaching or suggestion in the combination of Smith and Zou of a web server operable to establish communications with a web-communicating input device using the World Wide Web and producing at least one user-specified output character for use in a field of an e-mail in response to receipt of an input code from the web-communicating input device. Accordingly, independent claims 40 and 41 are believed to be allowable over Smith in view of Zou.

Claims 42 and 43 depend from amended claim 41 and incorporate all of the limitations of amended claim 41 and are therefore allowable over Smith in view of Zou for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 41.

Accordingly, claims 40-43 are believed to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allowance of claims 40-43 is respectfully requested.

2. New Claims

Claim 44 depends from amended claim 1 and incorporates all of the limitations of amended claim 1 and is therefore allowable over Smith in view of Zou for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 1. Claim 45 depends from amended claim 20 and incorporates all of the limitations of amended claim 20 and is therefore

allowable over Smith in view of Zou for, among other reasons, the same reasons as given above with respect to amended claim 20.

3. Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 2/17/05

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5531
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

By Jean M. Tibbetts

Jean M. Tibbetts
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,193